



Attachment B

To: NSF, Division of Contracts and Complex Agreements
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 475, Arlington, VA 22230
Attention: Erica White
Telephone: 703-292-5399
Fax Number: 703-292-9140 or 703-292-9141
Reference: RFQ DCCA-060018

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SURVEY

Background Information (for person filling out the survey):

Name:	E-Mail Address:
Title:	Organization:
Phone:	Fax:
Mailing Address:	Dates of Involvement From: To:

Contract Information (for the contract involved):

Company Being Rated:	Contract Number:
This firm was the: <input type="checkbox"/> Prime Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Sub-Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please Specify)	Total Contract Value:
Brief Description of Work: (ex. Multi-Disciplinary Support Services)	Complete Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Type of Contract: <input type="checkbox"/> FFP <input type="checkbox"/> T&M <input type="checkbox"/> CNF <input type="checkbox"/> CPFF <input type="checkbox"/> CPAF <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please Specify)	
If CPAF, provide overall fee rating:	
Cost: Below On Above by Estimate Target Estimate % <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Schedule: Behind On Ahead by <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> months

Based on your knowledge of the contract identified above, please provide your assessment of how well the contractor performed on each of the following topics. Please explain factors beyond the contractor's control that affected performance.

Definitions

Quality of Product or Service

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory	Non-conformances are jeopardizing the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, it constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards containing similar requirements.
Poor	Overall compliance requires significant Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract achievements.
Fair	Overall compliance requires minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract achievements.
Good	There are no, or very minimal, quality problems, and the Contractor has met the contract requirements.
Excellent	There are no quality issues, and the Contractor has substantially exceeded the contract performance requirements without commensurate additional costs to the Government.
Outstanding	The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that was significantly in excess of anticipated achievements and is commendable as an example for others, so that it justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

How would you rate the contractors:	Rating							Comments
	For each element							
1. Technical Excellence	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
1a Any significant performance breakthrough.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
1b Any significant performance problems.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
2. Quality of Deliverables; accuracy of reports	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
3. Performance/ Qualifications of Personnel	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
4. Turnover of personnel	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
4a Impacted performance ____Yes ____No	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
4b Turnover of Key Personnel ____%	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	

How would you rate the contractors:	Rating							Comments
	For each element							
4c Total turnover of personnel _____%; Total Staffing level	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
4d Any labor management issues	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5. Management	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5a Supervision of staff	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5b Supervision of Subcontractor (seamless)	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5c Compliance with subcontracting goals Exceeds__ Meets__ Fails__ State goals & accomplishments /explanation of variances	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5d Compliance with Quality Assurance Plan	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5e Appropriate resources made available.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5f Effective/proactive problem avoidance	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5g Effective correction of deficiency/problem	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5h Effective support of fluctuating workloads	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5i Effective phase-in (i.e.; on-going task, incumbent retention, NSF interface/dependency)	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	

Cost Control

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

- Unsatisfactory** Ability to manage cost issues is jeopardizing performance of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, this level of ability to manage cost issues constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards.
- Poor** Ability to manage cost issues requires significant Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
- Fair** Ability to control cost issues requires significant Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
- Good** There are no, or very minimal, cost management issues and the Contractor has met the contract requirements.
- Excellent** There are no cost management issues, and the Contractor has exceeded the contract requirements, achieving cost savings to the Government.
- Outstanding** The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor achieved cost savings and performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

This questionnaire is source selection sensitive when completed. See FAR 3.104

How would you rate the contractors:	Rating							Comments
	For each element							
1. Within budget (over/under target costs)	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
2. Ability to develop reasonable cost estimates and deliver within those estimates.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
3. Cost efficient	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
4. Current, accurate, and complete billings.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
5. Capability to adjust to Agency financial constraints.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
6. Relationship of negotiated costs to actual.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	

Timeliness of Performance

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory Delays are jeopardizing the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, it constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards.

Poor Delays require significant Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Fair Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Good There are no, or minimal, delays that impact achievement of contract requirements.

Excellent There are no delays, and the Contractor has exceeded the agreed upon time schedule.

Outstanding The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

How would you rate the contractors:	Rating							Comments
	For each element							
1. Timeliness of deliverables	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
2. Adherence to schedules	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
3. Responsive to emergencies	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	
4. Responsive to technical	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A	

Business Relations

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory	Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues are not effective. If not substantially mitigated or corrected it should constitute a significant impediment in considerations for future awards.
Poor	Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues are marginally effective.
Fair	Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues are somewhat effective.
Good	Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues are consistently effective.
Excellent	Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues exceeds Government expectation.
Outstanding	The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

How would you rate the contractors:	Rating								Comments
	For each element								
1. Positive interface with NSF personnel/end user community.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A		
2. Prompt notification of problems/issues to CO/COTR.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A		
3. Compliance with contract requirements.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A		
4. Business like correspondence.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A		
5. Planned and executed contract transition without impacting performance.	5	4	3	2	1	0	N/A		

Overall

I would hire this contractor again. YES NO

Comments:

Evaluated By: _____
Signature Date

On behalf of the NSF and myself, thank you for your cooperation.

Erica White

This questionnaire is source selection sensitive when completed. See FAR 3.104